# MEDICAL DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

PART I: GENERAL INFORMATION	
Type of Requestor: (X) HCP () IE () IC	<b>Response Timely Filed?</b> (X) Yes () No
Requestor First Street Surgical Center	MDR Tracking No.: M4-04-3339-01
411 First St.	TWCC No.:
Bellaire, TX 77401	Injured Employee's Name:
Respondent ZNAT Insurance Co.	Date of Injury:
Rep. Box # 47	Employer's Name: Avance Inc.
	Insurance Carrier's No.: 120985

### PART II: SUMMARY OF DISPUTE AND FINDINGS

Dates of Service CPT Code(s) or Description		Amount in Dispute	Amount Due	
From	То	CIT Code(s) of Description	Amount in Dispute	Amount in Dispute Amount Due
		25000	\$3478.00	\$1001.52
5-19-03	5-19-03	Insurance carrier paid		<\$1118.00>
		Total Amount Due		\$0.00

## PART III: REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

Where did carrier get \$1118.00 as the maximum allowable. We are not on a fee schedule. So where does this amount come from. This payment is not fair nor is it reasonable.

## PART IV: RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

We continue to believe that the requestor is not entitled to additional reimbursement..

## PART V: MEDICAL DISPUTE RESOLUTION REVIEW SUMMARY, METHODOLOGY, AND/OR EXPLANATION

This dispute relates to services provided in an Ambulatory Surgical Center that are not covered under a fee guideline for this date of service. Accordingly, the reimbursement determined through this dispute resolution process must reflect a fair and reasonable rate as directed by Commission Rule 134.1. This case involves a factual dispute about what is a fair and reasonable reimbursement for the services provided.

Claimant underwent exploration of right dorsal radial aspect of wrist with elevation of flaps; adhesiolysis of subcutaneous tissue adhesions and contracture; release of de Quervain's tenosynovitis with first compartment release of extensor mechanism; tenolysis, extensor mechanism, first extensor compartment, right upper extremity; tenosynovectomy of traumatic impinging tenosynovium, right wrist; dorsal fascial release of right wrist; and soft tissue flap advancement reconstruction, dorsal radial aspect, right wrist.

The insurance carrier paid \$1118.00.

After reviewing the documentation provided by both parties, it appears that neither party has provided convincing documentation that sufficiently discusses, demonstrates, and justifies that their purported amount is a fair and reasonable reimbursement (Rule 133.307). After reviewing the services, the charges, and both parties' positions, it is clearly evident that some other amount represents the fair and reasonable reimbursement.

During the rule development process for facility guidelines, the Commission had contracted with Ingenix, a professional firm specializing in actuarial and health care information services, in order to secure data and information on reimbursement ranges for these types of services. The results of this analysis resulted in a recommended range for reimbursement for workers' compensation services provided in these facilities. In addition, we received information from both ASCs and insurance carriers in the recent rule revision process. While not controlling, we considered this information in order to find data related to commercial market payments for these services. This information provides a very good benchmark for determining the "fair and reasonable" reimbursement amount for the

services in dispute.				
the reimbursement range recommended by information submitted by the parties and th considering the similarity of the various pro Ingenix range. Based on this review, the ordecision for no additional reimbursement w	the Ingenix study (from 192.6% to 256.3% of the issues related to the specific procedures perocedures involved in this surgery, staff selecting reimbursement on these services was	in this case to the amounts that would be within of Medicare for 2003). Staff considered the other erformed in this dispute. Based on this review and ted a reimbursement amount in the low end of the in the medium end of the Ingenix range. The a care provider billing and insurance adjusting case.		
, 1	ties' positions, the Ingenix range for applicab	•		
experienced staff members in Medical Rev	iew, we find that no additional reimbursement	nt is due for these services.		
PART VI: COMMISSION DECISION				
Based upon the review of the disputed not entitled to additional reimbursement Findings and Decision by:		Division has determined that the requestor is		
	Elizabeth Pickle, RHIA	July 6, 2005		
Authorized Signature	Typed Name	Date of Order		
PART VII: YOUR RIGHT TO REQUEST A	A HEARING			
for a hearing must be in writing and it (twenty) days of your receipt of this dec care provider and placed in the Austin Edays after it was mailed and the first wo Texas Administrative Code § 102.5(d)) P.O. Box 17787, Austin, Texas, 78744  The party appealing the Division's Decinvolved in the dispute.	must be received by the TWCC Chief Clision (28 Texas Administrative Code § 1 Representatives box on rking day after the date the Decision was . A request for a hearing should be sent t or faxed to (512) 804-4011. A copy of the	and has a right to request a hearing. A request Clerk of Proceedings/Appeals Clerk within 20 48.3). This Decision was mailed to the health This Decision is deemed received by you five placed in the Austin Representative's box (28 o: Chief Clerk of Proceedings/Appeals Clerk, his Decision should be attached to the request. en request for a hearing to the opposing party cia, favor de llamar a 512-804-4812.		
PART VIII: INSURANCE CARRIER DELI	VERY CERTIFICATION			
I hereby verify that I received a copy of	f this Decision and Order in the Austin F	Representative's box.		
Signature of Insurance Carrier:				
		Date:		